

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS



Addenda to the Ḥudūd al-'Ālam

Author(s): V. Minorsky

Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1955), pp. 250-270

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of [School of Oriental and African Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/610422>

Accessed: 22/03/2013 18:37

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and School of Oriental and African Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ADDENDA TO THE ḤUDŪD AL-‘ĀLAM

By V. MINORSKY

WHEN my translation of the *Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam* was published in 1937, it was found impossible to swell the book ¹ by further remarks on the language of the Persian original, and I promised (p. xii) to deal with this problem at a later date.

On the other hand, the quarter of a century which has elapsed since I began my work on the *Ḥudūd* has brought a considerable number of new facts bearing on the interpretation of the data which I was trying to explain. In various ways my work has been continued, both in the articles which can be considered as a by-product of the *Ḥudūd*,² and in contributions on fresh but cognate texts.³ The object of my present article is to bring the book up to date by integrating my own research and by completing it with references to the studies of other scholars.

PART I

In my translation of the *Ḥudūd*, the actual Persian expressions (either in transcription, or in the original) have been profusely quoted throughout the text. This enables me in the following to refer only to the more typical cases. I wish to mention here the valuable work on the evolution of Persian style by the late poet-laureate Bahār (*Sabk-shināsī*, 3 vols. undated, from 1331/1942 on); as a specimen of the *Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam* he quotes only its Introduction (II, 17–18), but in his careful analysis of the peculiarities of older Persian (I, 300–436) he often gives examples from our text (I, 367, 368, 376, 378, 384, 387, 403, 425).

I. SPELLINGS

A desire to distinguish between the *ma'rūf* (ī, ū) and *majhūl* (ē, ō) sounds can be traced in the MS. *Kūhsaym* seems to indicate *-sēm* (instead of the usual *šim*), 24a. Some local *ē/ā* are indicated by the forms *Anbār* (**Anbēr*), 21a, as against *Ist.*, 270, *Anbār*, and *shahr-salār* (**salēr* for *salār*?). *Īmadh* (for *Āmid*), 10b, is a strange combination of the Arabic *imāla* with the Persian *dh* after a vowel. The vocalization *Raudhān* corresponds to **Rōdhān* and *Kaumīs* to **Kōmīs*, 7a and 17a. One cannot attach importance to *Sauk-jū* for *Sūk-chou*, 14a, etc.

¹ *Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam*, a Persian geography of 372/982, translated and explained by V. Minorsky, Gibb Memorial Series, N.S., XI, 1937, 20 + 554 pp.

² Such as 'Une nouvelle source persane sur les Hongrois au X^e siècle', in *Nouvelle Revue de Hongrie*, April, 1937, pp. 305–312; 'A Persian Geographer of A.D. 982 on the Orography of Central Asia', in *GJ*, September, 1937, pp. 259–264.

³ Such as 'Marvazi on China, the Turks, and India', Arabic text (*circa* A.D. 1120) with an English translation and commentary. J. G. Forlong Fund, XXII, The Royal Asiatic Society, 1942, 170 + 53 pp.; 'Tamīm ibn Bahr's journey to the Uyghurs', *BSOAS*, 1948, XII/2, pp. 275–305; 'Gardizi on India', *BSOAS*, 1948, XII/3, pp. 625–640; my series of 'Caucasica' (I–IV) in *BSOAS*, supplemented by *Studies in Caucasian History* (I), 1953, and finally my recent research on Abū Dulaf Mis'ar ibn Muḥalhil's travels in Iran (to appear in Cairo in 1955, ان شاء الله).

Khuwar, 19b, suggests that *w* after *kh* was still pronounced before a short vowel. [The names of the two neighbouring boroughs: *Khvar* and *Khusp* (whatever their origin) suggest a pun: ‘eat and sleep’.]

The *idāfat* after *ā* and *ū* is usually expressed by a *hamza* 7a, 7a, *درازناء او* 13b, or even omitted 32b. Of the word *tarsā* the plural is spelt 32a, *ترسان* (a spelling which has survived only in some place-names like *برآن* in Isfahan).

Ki ‘which’ standing alone is regularly spelt *کی*; otherwise it is usually joined with the words that follow: 2a, *كانجا*; ‘at the time wanted by them’.

Dh, intervocalic and final (after vowels), is regularly marked but the initial *ḏ* in *dhadhagān*, 17a, *Dhakhkhas*, 24a, and *Dharnūkh* looks strange. By the side of *zimistān*, 19a, we have 18a clearly *dimistān* and 16b *dhimistān* (?). (On the form *dimistān* see H. W. Bailey, *JRAS*, 1931, i33 (on the Kumzari dialect, Oman).)

The letter *ف* (with three dots)—typical for Eastern Iranian usage (for *w/β*)—occurs in 10b, 27b; *يافا* for Jaffa, 9a, 9a, *ثجاخ/فجاخ* (?); 20b, and apparently in 10b, 38a, but it is difficult to decide what reasons underlie this erratic practice. In 1258, when our text was copied, it may have been but a survival of a sign no more understood.

Sad ‘one hundred’ is spelt with *ص* but *shast* ‘sixty’ with a *sīn*. Geographical names are given in a Persian garb: *Būshang* (for Arabicized *Būshanj*); *Khūna* and *Kara* (for *Khūnaj* and *Karaj*), *Adharbādthagān*, **Harē* (Herat), etc.

2. GRAMMAR

The style of the *Hudūd* is matter-of-fact. The sentences are short and purely descriptive, which naturally reduces the field of observations on grammar and syntax.

(a) Nouns

Quite often nouns without any addition stand for locatives: *Bukhārā nishīnadh*, 19a; *in nāhiyat kharān-i nīk uftadh* ‘good asses are found in the region’, 34b.

Diminutives are very common: *shahrak*; *shākhak* ‘a small branch’, 7a; *biyābānak*, 12, *daryāyak* ‘a lake’, 37a; *nāhiyatak*, 38b.

The plural ending *-ān/-agān* is still general for animate beings: *jānāvarān*, 2a; **dadthagān*, 17a; *gabrāgān* (a plural of *gabra* and not of a diminutive *gabrak*, cf. *Fārs-nāma*, Nicholson’s Introduction, xxix); and even *hamdūnagān*, 34a.

The suffix *-īna* is used for groups and kinds of beings and things: *gīlīmīna* ‘various kinds of *gīlīms*’, 22b; *rūdhīna* perhaps ‘madder’ (?), 32b (though, f. 33a: *rūnās*).

The suffix *-nā* appears in *dirāznā* ‘length’, 2a (but 7a: *dirāzā*); cf. *tangnā* ‘narrowness’, *Aḥsan al-tawārīkh*, 431.

Compounds of every kind are very frequent: *badh-dil*, *badh-rag* (see vocabulary), *giyā-khwār*, *tang-'alaf* 'wanting in grass', *javānmard-pīsha* 'professional stalwart', 25b; *yak-izār bāshand* 'they are people wearing only the *izār*', 15a; *tan-durust* 'healthy', referring both to men and to the climate, 27a. *Bisyār* is often used with nouns as an adjective expressing abundance: *shahrīst bisyār-mardum* 'a populous town', 18a; *bisyār-pādshāy* 'with many kings (or *pādshā'i* kingdoms?)', 14a; *mardumānī bisyār-zar* 'wealthy (moneyed) men', 39b. Such compound adjectives are then used as comparatives: *bisyār-khwāsta-tar*, 19a, or superlatives: *bisyār-nī'mat-tarīn*, 32b.

The pronouns *ū*, *vay*, and *ān* indiscriminately refer to single or several objects, both animate and inanimate: *si andar vay* 'three out of (seven)', 4a; *shish jazīra az vay . . . ān-ra khāliya khwānand*, 5a; *du jazīra . . . ū-ra s.qytrā khwānand*, 4b; *daryāyak-hā yakī az ū*, 4a. This curious usage seems to be connected with the use of singular and plural in the verb, see below under (d) 2.

The use of *ān-i* (with an *idafat*), both as '(someone's) own' and as a substitute for the noun already mentioned ('and that of') is frequent, see correction *ad* p. 87. In § 23, 6, *īn* seems to stand in the latter function *بارکده کرکانست و این کومس و نسابورست* 'J. is the store-place of G. and that of K. and N.', in which case the reading *īn-i Kūmis* should be presumed.

(b) Verbs

The present particle *mī/hamī* occurs rarely, e.g. in *kūhī az gird-i īn jazīra bar-āyadh* one would expect *mī-*; when used, it usually stresses the meaning as 'continually, ever': *va hamī-ravadh tā hama(-i) nāhiyat-i Nūba bi-burradh*, 11b.

Particle *bi-*, as attested by the spelling *به برز* 5b, seems to have sounded *ba-*. When added to the past it seems to give it the sense of what in Slavonic languages is called 'perfective aspect': *va bīshatar-i āb-i īn shahr-hā az chashma-hā-st ki andar zamīn biyāvarda-and* 'have brought underground' (in Russian: *провели*), 19a; *rūdh-kadha-hā-yi ū bi-kanda-and*.

A considerable number of verbs, now chiefly transitive, are used intransitively: *bar-dāradh*, *bar-gīradh* 'begins, starts', 2b; *bāz-dāradh* 'adjoins', etc., see Vocabulary; *bikashadh* 'stretches', 2b; *bi-kushāyadh* 'branches off', 3b; *andar ū namak bandadh* 'salt is formed'; *tā ānjā ki bi-burradh* 'down to where it ends', 5b.

**Gudhārdan* is used as a causative of *gudhashtan*: *kūhīst . . . bārkhā kī bar pusht basta bāshand bad-ān kūh *bighudhārand* 'they carry over', 15b.

The verb *dāshtan* serves almost as an auxiliary in such expressions as: *bar sar bar-nihādha dārand* 'wear on their heads', 37b; (*shalvār*) *bar sar-i zānū gird-karda dārand*, 37b. cf. Gardīzī (Barthold), 92: *va chīz-i ki ishān-rā ba-kār āyad ān āvīkhta dārand*.

After *tavān* and *bāyad* usually the full form of the infinitive is found: *va ān . . . na-tavān kushādan*, 7a; *du-tāh tavān kardan*, 38a; *bi-bāyadh burīdhan*, 34a. But: *ba hama jīhān na-tavān dānist* 'it is impossible to know it even for a whole world', or perhaps 'unknown throughout the whole world', 27b.

The composite future is very rare: *bīdānist ki tūfān hamī khwāhad būd* 'he knew that the flood would happen'. *Hāmī khwāhad* seems to indicate the stage at which *khwāhad* had not yet become a mere auxiliary.

The past participle used with *-ast* has a passive meaning by itself, whereas

at present one would expect the auxiliary verbs (*shudan*, *gardīdan*): *bar ān kūh . . . ṣūrat-i har maliki nigāshā-ast va sar-gudhasht-hā-yi īshān bar ān jay nibishā-ast* ‘are represented . . . are written’ (27b); *andar miyān-i kūh-u daryā nihādha-ast* ‘is situated’, 29b [cf. Juvaynī, III, 235: *gūrī nihāda-ast*].

This helps us to explain the difficult passage: *mar ū-rā andar kitāb-hā(-i) akhbār yādh kardā-ast* (see below, p. 258), where *kardā-ast* corresponds to the present-day *karda shuda-ast*.

(c) Prepositions and Particles

Az stresses the use of *ān-i* (see above): *pādhā’ī az ān-i Balharāy-ast* ‘kingship belongs to B.’, 14b, 15a.

Bā/bāz indicates direction: *bāz mashriq rasad*, 2a; *bā daryā-yi Khwārazm uftadh* ‘(the Jaxartes) flows to (into) the Aral sea’.

Bi with *shudhan*: *bi daryā-yi a’zam shavadh* ‘turns into a great sea’ (in Russian становится морем).

The use of prepositions combined with postposition (as frequent in the *Shāh-nama*) is not attested in the *Hudūd*: in the sentence *bar sar bar-nihādha dārand*, 37b, the second *bar* is only a pre-verb belonging to *nihādhan*.

Chand with the following *yā-yi vahdat* stands for ‘the size of . . .’: *chand gūsfandī*, 35b; *har yakī chand kabkī* ‘as big as a quail’, 38a. cf. *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, 261: *chand māda-pīlī*.

Particle *-rā* is sometimes attached to the subject: *dihqān-i īn nahiyat-rā az mulūk-i atrāf budandī*, 24a; *īn du kūh-rā dar kutub-hā-i Baṭlamīyūs madhkūr-ast*, 4a.¹ cf. Zhukovsky, *Kashf al-mahjūb*, Introduction, Nicholson, *Tadhkirat al-auliya*, II, Introduction, 9. Sometimes, as a postposition, *-rā* completes a preposition: *az bahr-i tavālud-rā*, 5a. Sometimes it is omitted: *mardānīshān (rā ?) hīch kār nīst*, 30b. *Mar* as announcing *-rā* is rare: *mar nigāh dāshtan-i nāhiyat-rā* ‘for keeping the province (safe)’, 37a.

(d) Syntax

1. Phrases

The order of words in a phrase is free and expressive: *va paydhā kardīm hama-i jazīrahā-ī ki-buzurg-ast, az ābādhān-i vay va vīrān* (2a); *va ammā rūdh-i ṭabī’ī ān-ast kī ābhā’ī buvadh buzurg kī az gudhāz-i barf . . . bikushāyadh* (8b). Adjectives often stand separated from the nouns to which they refer, at the end of the sentence: *shākh-ī az sūy-i maghrīb bāz kashadh khurd* (8a); *rūdhkhā kī andar jīhān-ast buzurg* (2a).

The asyndeton construction and anacolutha are very frequent: *nuhum jazīra’īst . . . Hiranj khwānand* ‘[which] they call H.’, 4b; *yakī az ān kūh-i Kūfj khwānand andar miyān-i biyābān-ast* ‘[which] lies in a desert’, 7a; *nāhiyat-hā-i junūb mardumānīsh siyāh-and*, 39a; *nāhiyat-īst mashriq-i vay rūdh-i Ātil . . . va mardumānī-and kīsh-i Ghūziyān dārand* ‘to the east of [which] is the Ātil . . . and they are people (who) have the religion of the Ghūz’; *har yakī az-īn kūh ū-rā nām-hā-i bisyār-ast*, 6a; *nām-i qaumī-st bar kūh-i Bulgharī nishīnad*, 37a. In some of such cases the *yā-yi ishārat* seems to be the link with what follows.²

¹ The meaning seems to be: ‘and as regards the two mountains they are mentioned’.

² A similar construction is known in Kurdish.

2. *Singular and Plural*

The complicated problem of the use of plural and singular in Persian verbs was treated by M. Minovi in *JRAS*, 1942/I, 41–7. He admits that ‘more often than not’, he had to depend on his ears and that the rules cannot be formulated in a way ‘that those to whom Persian is not natal could exercise their own judgment’. On the whole, he thinks that after inanimate and abstract nouns verbs should not be used in the plural. To this rule he adds a rider that this use seems to be subject to the ‘spirit of the verb’. If the action it expresses is ‘the peculiarity of human beings’ plural might be used.

In grammar the only safe method is induction, and the ‘rules’ of the grammarians can be taken only as generalizations from the facts observed. Outsiders cannot tamper with the facts provided by the speakers, but in the formulation of the conclusions foreigners have often rendered help to the building up of national grammars. Two points are certain :—

(1) The subject must be treated historically¹: what is accepted at one period may be rejected as ‘incorrect’ at a later date.

(2) Poetical quotations are less reliable than prose in view of the temptations to which poets are exposed.

On the whole, one might suggest as a ‘working hypothesis’ the view that the choice of singular or plural in Persian is often dictated by the character of the subject in the sentence. Should the plural elements composing the subject represent a kind of collective total, the verb is used in the singular; should they, on the contrary, have individual characteristics, or be meant to be personified, the plural is admissible. Therefore, using Minovi’s examples: *biring-hā rīkht* requires the singular because not the individual grains but their collective mass is in view; *panj sarbāz rasīd* also singular, because the five soldiers are treated as a group; but in *dar an vaqt panj shā’ir-e buzurg būdand* ‘at that time there were five great poets’, I should venture a plural because the poets cannot be de-personalized as grains, or even as soldiers; *sang-hā az ham mī-tarakīdand* ‘the stones (began) to burst’, requires a plural not because their action is a ‘peculiarity of human beings’, but because they went off one after the other, and not like in the case when ‘five ton of stones’ was exploded.

Here are some illustrations from the *Hudūd*: *daryāyak-hā-i khurd bisyār-ast chūn daryāyak-hā-i kī yakī az-ū* (sic) *andar kūh-hā-i Gūzgānān-ast . . . va chinānk(i) andar kūh-hā-i Tūs-ast va kūh-hā-i Tabaristān-ast va l(ā)kin na-ma’rūf-and* (sic) *va yā vaqt būvadh ki khushk shavadh* (sic), 4b. In this passage the lakes are treated first indefinitely in singular; then plural is introduced, as it seems with reference to the lakes enumerated by name; then a singular is used to show that some particular group dries up at times. *Har qaumī k-andar nāhiyat-hā(i) mukhtalif-and*, 1b. Here the plural is used *ad sensum*, whether with regard to the collective *qaum* ‘people’, or to the numerous cases. Other examples: *hama-biyābān-hā ki ma’rūf-ast*, meaning the totality, 2a. *هفتم دریاژه . . . کی از چهار رود پیوندد کی از بتمان کشاید* ‘from the four rivers which (jointly) come out of Buttamān’, 4a.

A special use of plural is for recurring seasons: *ba-vaqt-i bahārān* ‘in the spring’, 9a (in Russian *вёснами*) (see below, p. 270).

¹ On the lines of M. T. Bahār’s *Sabk-shināsī*.

3. VOCABULARY

The following selection concentrates on the uses of words and shades of meaning more than on technical terms, the equivalents of which are given in the text and in the Indexes: D. on the products and E. of special terms, *Hudūd*, pp. 520–4.

ābādihān ‘prosperous, inhabited’, 3a, 3b, 17b, 18a; *ābādihānī* ‘cultivated lands, a settlement’, 4a.

abānk (*abānak*?) -i *surkh*, meaning unknown (a textile?), 26a.

ābkāma ‘a sauce or condiment of milk, buttermilk, seeds of wild rue, yeast, and vinegar’, Zhukovsky, *Razvalini Merva*, 1894, p. 22 (quoting the *Hudūd*).

āb-khiz ‘floods’, 20a.

afvāh ‘aromas’, 5b.

akka ‘magpie’, 9a.

ālāt ‘objects’, 17a; ‘accessories, utensils’, 21b.

āmila ‘embilica officinalis’, 15b (Laufer, 581).

āmizanda ‘sociable, good mixer’, 17b. *‘amūd-i rūdh* ‘the main stream of the river’, 8b.

andakī ‘a small quantity’, 5b; *rūdh-i Nīl andakī buvadh* ‘dwindles’, 3b.

andar parāgandan ‘to scatter’, 6a.

anguzad ‘asafetida’.

arzan ‘millet’, 37b (cf. *jāvars*).

arziz ‘lead’, 23a (see *surb*); ‘tin’, 4b.

turkân-i āshkī ‘trucial Turks’, 24b.

bādhbizan ‘a fan’, 23a.

badh-dīl ‘cowards’ (Vullers, I, 201: *timidus*), 38b, but *badh-rag* ‘malicious’ (see Vullers, I, 203: *malae stirpis, malae naturae, malignus*), 18b.

az bahr-i ān ‘therefore’, 4a; *nuh bahr* and *nuh-yak* ‘one-ninth’, 2a.

bār ‘plenty’ (*bār-and* ‘are numerous’), 17a.

bar-dāradh ‘begins’, 2b; ‘separates’, 6b; *bar-girādh* ‘begins’, 2b, 5b; ‘shoots off’, 6a; (*raftan*) *bar* ‘to skirt’, 11b; *bar hudūd* . . . *bigudharadh* ‘marches with’, 12b; *ba bar-i Ghūz* ‘towards the Ghuz, to the Ghuz side’, 18b.

barākūh ‘the slope of a mountain, uplands’, 17b, cf. *barākūh va bar sar-i ān-kūh* ‘on the slope and on the top’, 28b. cf. *Barākūh*, a mountain in Osh, see Barthold, *Turkestan*,

p. 156; and the *nisba Barākūhī* in *Tārīkh-i Bayhaq*, 153.

bastan: *ghalaba bastan* ‘to vanquish’, 38a.

bāz ‘toll’, 25b, but *bāzhgāh* ‘toll-house’, 33a.

bāzargānī (*bāzurgānī*?) ‘current money’, 34a; ‘profit, transaction’, 36a.

bāz dāradh bi . . . ‘adjoins’, 3b; *bāz gardadh* ‘turns off, separates’, 6a; *bāz kashadh* ‘separates, shoots off’, 8a.

bāz-khwāndan . . . *ba* ‘to call something after something’, 29b.

bijashk (**pijashk*) ‘a doctor’, 29a.

bīrūn az ‘apart from, except’, 4a.

burīdhan ‘to end, to cease’, 5b.

chādar (now *chadur*) ‘a kind of light shawl’, 34a.

dāngū-hā(-i) khurdanī ‘edible cereals’, 32b.

dāradh ‘there is’, *har kūhī-rā mihtarī dāradh*, 7a; *dāradh az* . . . *ba* . . . ‘stretches from . . . to’, 9a; *dāradh* . . . *ba* ‘is contiguous’, 19a.

darāzā ‘length’, 7a; *darāznā*, 2a.

dīda-bān, 24a, corresponds to Ist. 333: *al-jabal allādhī ‘alayhi marqab al-ahrās ‘alā al-Turk* ‘the mountain on which is the observation post of the guards (watching) the Turks’. Consequently *dīda-bān*, in the idea of the author, is connected with the verb *dīdan*. In the same sense the word is used in Arabic (plur. *diyādiba* ‘watchers’, see Ṭabarī, III, 1229).

dīgar ‘for the rest, moreover’, 38a.

falāta ‘sweet dish made of ewe’s milk’, V. A. Zhukovsky, *Razvalini Merva*, 1894, p. 21 (quoting the *Hudūd*), 20a. *fanak* ‘weasel’ (?), 17a. [French dictionaries give *fennec*, petit renard des régions sahariennes’. Is this the original meaning?]

furūdh āyadh ba . . . ‘follows, takes (a direction)’, 6a, 7a.

fuzūdhan ‘to grow, to increase’, 3a.

ganda ‘bad-smelling’, 10b.

gardanda bar havā ‘(nomads) wandering in accordance with the seasons’, 22b.

- gāvars* 'millet, vetch', 26b. In the corresponding passages of Istakhri, 166-7: *dhurra* 'sorghum', but *Ya'qūbī*, *BGA*, VII, 295: *wa laysa bi-Turk-astān zar' illā al-dukhān, wa huwa al-jāwars* (i.e. *gāvars*). cf. also I. Faḍlān, Mashhad MS., 203b.
- gazīt*: *sar-gazīt* 'poll-tax', 16b (Arabic *jizya*), for the form, cf. *mazgīt*.
- ghizhgāw* 'yak, bos grunniens', 17a.
- gird andar āyadh* 'forms a circle', 6b; *az gird-i Kavar andar āyadh* or *gardadh* 'makes a sweep round', 10a.
- giyā-khwār* 'a prairie', 8b.
- gū* 'a sphere, a globe', 2a.
- bi-gudārānd* (**bi-gudhārand*) 'they carry over', 15a; *gudhashtan* (?) 'to cross (a river)', 16a.
- gudhāzanda* 'fusible', 22b.
- hadd* 'extent, length' (as opposed to *karāna* 'limit'), 2b; *hudūd* (1) 'confines (i.e. the area within certain limits)', 6a, 10a (cf. Preface, pp. i and xv); (2) 'marches, outlying territories', §§ 24, 26.
- ḥamdūna* 'a baboon', 34a.
- ḥavāṣīl* 'a pelican', 5b.
- illā-kī* (after negation) 'but', 7b.
- jauz [gōz]-i buwā* 'a nutmeg', 5b.
- jāwars*, see *gāvars*.
- jiḥāz* 'merchandise, commodities', 15a, 16b, 34a.
- jūr.b* 'bags (stockings?)', 37a (the form possibly reflects the Arabic original).
- ba-zar kanda* 'inlaid with gold', 15b.
- kapī* 'monkey', 34a.
- karāna* 'confines, limits', 2b.
- kārdār* 'deputy governor', 13b, 20b; *kārkard* 'works', 21a; *bi-kār dārānd* 'they use', 12b, 30a; *bi kār shavadh* 'is used, used up (?)', 10b, 11b, 29b.
- **karg* (*k.rk*) 'rhinoceros', 14.
- k.rk.rī* 'some Indian bird', 14a. H. W. Bailey compares this name with Skt. *kukkūṭī* 'domestic fowl', which survives in many Indian dialects. [In *IF*, 13₁₃: *juwānk.rk* 'a fantastic bird (?)'.]
- kashāvarz* [sic] *kunand* 'they till', 17b.
- kāz* 'a hut', 37b.
- kazdum* (for *kazhdum*) 'a scorpion', 32a.
- khar-i waḥshī* 'wild ass' (Persice: *gōr*), 8b.
- khargāh* 'felt hut', 6b.
- khāukhūr-i chinī* 'some kind of (silk) textile', 13b, 30a (see below, note ad p. 84).
- khayzurān* 'bamboo', 5b.
- khing-but* 'the White Idol', 21b.
- khunb* (now *khum*) 'earthen vessel', 37b.
- khutū* 'rhinoceros horn', 13b; but see *surū*. cf. Manīnī-'Utbī, II, 31, and Minorsky, *Marvazi*, p. 82.
- khwār*, e.g. *giyā-khwār*, 17b, 'grazing-ground'; *mardum-khwāra* 'man-eater', 4b.
- khwāsta* 'wealth, belongings', 2a.
- kīmukhta* 'shagreen', 30a.
- khushk* 'dry land, mainland', 5a; *Jāba-yi khushk*, 6b, 'Jāba of the mainland'; *khushk-rūdh* 'dry bed', 22b.
- jāma-yi k.nīs*, some kind of textile, 30a.
- kushūdhan* 'to conquer', 7a; *az gudhāz-i barf bi-kushāyadh* 'is formed from the thawing of snow', 8b.
- mardum* 'a man', 6a; *mardumān* 'men', 6a; *mardumānī-and ba-mardum nazdīk* 'they are men near to humanity', 17b; *dūrtar az tab'-i mardī* 'more remote from humanity', 36b.
- maḥfūrī* 'stamped velvet', 33b; cf. *Rāḥat al-ṣudūr*, 512; *Mujmal al-tavārīkh*, 101; Dozy, Supp. I, 303.
- Mānavī* 'Manichæan', 23a.
- jāy-i manzil* 'port of call', 4b.
- mār-i shikanj* 'deadly snake', 28b.
- ma'rūfgar* 'a pious man, a conformist', 31a.
- mazgīt-i ādhīna* 'a Friday mosque', 14b, 27a.
- māhmān-dār* 'hospitable', 29b.
- ba-miyāna* 'in the centre', 4b; *bar-miyāna* 'on the middle (course?)', perhaps 'a middling (town)', 16a.
- murtafī* 'excellent', 4b.
- musalmānī* 'Islamic world', 17b; 'Islamic behaviour', 16a.
- mūy* 'furs', 17b, cf. Gardīzī, 100.
- nāḥiyat* 'direction', 6a; *hama-nāḥiyat* 'every direction'; also 'a region'.
- nakhchīr-zan* 'a hunter', 17a.
- na-ma'rūf* 'unknown', 4a; *nē-badh* 'not bad, so-so', 20a; *na-mahdūd* 'indefinite, unlimited', 8a.
- namāz-burda* 'to venerate', 18b.
- namūdhan*: *musalmānī namāyadh* 'he makes show of Islam', 16a.
- nighūshāk* 'Manichæan auditors', 23a.
- nihād* 'the lie (of a country)', 2a.

nīk-akhtari ‘auspiciousness’, 1b.
ni‘mat, for the meaning see Translation, pp. 126, 162; *kam-ni‘mat va bisyār-mardum*, 4b; *bisyār ni‘mat va kam-khwāsta*, 37a. This special use differs from *Gulistān*, ch. II, story 18, where *ni‘mat* stands for ‘goods, wares’.
nishast ‘residence’, 17b, 28b; *andar nishastan* ‘to embark’, 13b; *bar nishastan* ‘to mount, to take the field’ (on an expedition), 15b, 19a.
padhīdh kardan ‘to elicit’, 13b (see *paydhā*).
pādshā ‘king’, 14, 16a; *pādshāh*, 16a; *padshā‘i* (often spelt *padshāy*) ‘kingdom’, 14b.
pānīdh ‘sugar, candy’, 21a.
paydhā kardan ‘bring to light, elucidate’, 1b, 2a.
pāy kūftan ‘to dance’, 30b.
pāy-zahr ‘an antidote’, 23b.
ghāzi-pīsha ‘a professional ghazi’.
pīshinagān ‘the earlier generations’, 2a.
pull for *pul* ‘a bridge’, 31a.
rāy ‘an Indian raja’, 6a.
rūdh ‘copper (red), brass’, 24b.
rūdh-kadha ‘river-bed, river’, 5b, 8b.
rūdh zadan ‘to play on a stringed instrument’, 30b.
rūspī-khāna ‘a brothel’, 15a.
rūnās ‘madder’ (in Barda’), 33a; *rūdhīna* in Mūqān, 32b, supported by I.Ĥ., 249, who refers to madder (*fuwwa*) in Varthān on the Araxes; *rūyan* [*sic*] on an island of the Caspian, 5b, cf. I.Ĥ., *ibid*.
rūyīn ‘made of brass’, 15a.
šābiyān, as applied ‘to (Turkish) heathens’, 17a.
s.bīja, some animal (?), 17a.
sakht ‘hardy’, 17a; *sakht azīm* ‘very great’, 8a.
samūr ‘sable-marten’, 6a.
sanjāb ‘grey squirrel, petit gris’, 6a.
sang-i fasān ‘whetstone’, 19b.
sāra ‘Indian turban’, 15a.
šifat kardan ‘to describe’, 7a.
shikanj: *mār-i shikanj* ‘a deadly snake, viper’, 28b.

siṭabr ‘thick’, 5b.
sar-gazūt, see *gazūt*.
shahr-i Jibāl ‘the J. province’, 10a; cf. *az īn shahr 70,000 jangī bīrūn āyadh*, 16b.
shamani ‘Buddhist’ (?), 13b.
shikastagī ‘hills, broken country’, 21b.
shūr-khisht (in Herat) ‘manna’, 20b (cf. *tarangabīn*).
sūdh-u ziyān ‘profit-cum-loss, i.e. trade’, 28b.
sunbādha ‘emery’, 5b.
sunbul ‘spikenard’, 5b.
sundus ‘a silk stuff?’, 37a.
surb ‘lead’, 6a.
surū ‘horn’; *surū-yi karg* ‘rhinoceros horn’, 13b (mentioned separately from *khutū*).
tākhtan baranda ‘a raider’, 17b.
ṭanfisa ‘carpets?’ (from Rūm), 37a.
tarangabīn (in Kish) ‘manna’, 23a (cf. *shūr-khisht*).
ṭayfūrī ‘a deep plate’, 30a; cf. Dozy, *JA*, 1848, XI, 101: *ṭayfūr* ‘plat creux et profond’. Muqaddasi, 23, calls the river of Gurgān ‘Ṭayfūrī’.
tāzī ‘Arabic’, 7a.
tūtak ‘parrot’, 14a.
tūdh-i sabīl ‘mulberries offered for God’s sake’, 33a.
tuwāngar (*tūngar*?), thus spelt throughout, ‘mighty, rich’, as opposed to *darvīsh* ‘poor’, 16b.
uftadh ba- ‘gets into, is brought to’, 15a; *uftadh az-* ‘comes from’.
yādhkard (*yādhgard*?) ‘memory, memorandum, notice’, 2a, 33b.
ḥayvān-i zabād ‘civet cat’, 5b.
zabarjad ‘chrysolite’.
zafān dāshtan ‘to know a language’.
zīrāk ‘because’.
zīra ‘cumin’, 26b, mis-spelt *zīrā*, 26b. *Zarīra* would be ‘sweet flag’, cf. Laufer, *Sino-Iranica*, 583, but Kerman is famous for cumin, cf. *Ist.*, 167, and Juvaynī, I, 16; *kasī-ki badhīn mauḍī qumāshī āvarad zīra-st ki ba-Kirmān tuḥfa mi-āvarad*.

PART II

A list of the reviews of my translation of the *Hudūd*, known to me, will be found in my bibliography, *BSOAS*, 1952, xiv/3, p. 676. I am obliged to Prof. I. I. Umnyakov (Samarqand), who drew my attention to a line which is

missing from my translation, whereby the orientation of § 16 (Chigil) is disfigured, and to Prof. A. Eghbal (Tehran) who in a conversation (Paris, 2nd October, 1937) corrected some of my readings of the difficult script of the original. I am sorry that the text of the *Hudūd*, printed in Tehran by Sayyid Jalāl al-dīn Tehrani, in appendix to his calendar (*gāh-nāma*) for the year 1314/1935, reached me too late to make use of some of his readings.¹

Here are my additional and fresh remarks on the text.

P. vii. More exactly the *H.*-*Ā.* was begun (not completed) in 372/982–3.

P. viii. Instead of *Ustādh* '*Ajab al-zamān bul-Ustādh-Khorāsān*, read : '*Ajab al-zamān, bal* ('nay even') *Ustādh-i Khorāsān*. (A. E.)

P. xiv. *Ba akhbār-hā shanīdīm* may refer to such special collections of stories as *Akhbār al-Šin*, etc., see Marvazī, Index, and below under p. 172. The meaning of 4a : *مر او را اندر کتبها اخبار یاد کرده است* is probably 'concerning them mention is made in the books of *akhbār*'.

P. 15. On Ahmad b. al-Ṭayyib al-Sarakhsī see now F. Rosenthal, 'Ahmad b. al-Ṭayyib as-Sarakhsī', in *American Oriental series*, vol. 16, 1943 (on geography pp. 58–81), with additions (from Ibn al-ʿAdīm) in *JAOS*, April, 1951, pp. 135–142. Sarakhsī lived apparently between 218/833 and 286/899.

P. 16. Yāqūt, *Irshād al-arīb*, I, 142 : *wa kāna . . . lil-Jayhānī . . . jawārīn yudirruhā 'alayya*. Barthold's interpretation of *jawārī* as 'female slaves' is wrong. See A. Muller in *Fihrist*, II, 56, who explains *jawārī* as a plural of *جارية* 'grants, pensions'.

P. 17. Balkhī's monthly salary was 500 (later 1,000) *dirhams*, not *dinars*. The mistake is not Barthold's but the translator's.

P. 24. Instead of *Tawāḍu' al-dunyā* A.E. suggests **nawāḥī*. Perhaps **mawāḍi'* ?

P. 37. *Bā-ni'mat* can be paralleled with the Greek *εὐδαίμων*, see Strabo, xi, 14, 4, 'prosperous, opulent'. In Russian 'благодатный'. But see Sa'dī, *Gulistān*, II, No. 18 : *kārvānī-rā bizadand va ni'mat-i bī-qiyās burdand*, which suggests 'goods'.

P. 49. Read *yādhkard* (A.E.) as in § 23, 67, *kārkard*.

P. 50. *Nihād* 'the lie of the Earth'. Penultimate : 'animals and fishes', read : 'which is the habitat (*ma'wā*) of the animals' (S.J.).

P. 51. 'Khūzistān and Ṣaymara', read : 'Khūzistān and *Baṣra' (A.E. and S.J.).

Pp. 61 and 194. The mysterious name of the range Mānisā (مانسا) may be connected with the Min-shan mountain on the frontier of Szechuan with Eastern Tibet, see Nevsky, 'On the name of the Tangut state', *Zapiski Inst. Vost.*, II/3, 1933, p. 145. But more appropriately *Mānisā* might stand for Nan-shan ? (نانشان*)

P. 71 read : *Khūkand-ghūn* 9a (*k* being clear).

P. 83–86. On China see now my commentary in 'Marvazī' and my article

¹ The corrections derived from these sources are acknowledged with the initials I.U., A.E., and J.T. The criticisms formulated in A. Z. V. Togan's article 'Die Völkerschaften des Chazarenreiches im neunten Jahrhundert', published during the war in *Kōrōsi Csoma Archivum*, 1940, III/1, pp. 40–75, seem to be based mostly on misunderstandings.

Tamīm ibn Baḥr, see above, p. 250. The word *khāvkīr* occurs in the text twice. Under China (13b), *khāvkīr-i *chīnī* (hardly *khavjīr* as in S.J.) comes after *ḥarīr va parand* and seems to refer to some special variety of this textile; under Sārī (30a) it stands without any qualification. One might recall here that in Persian *khāv* means ‘pile (of a textile)’. Under China, some confusion is not excluded with *kīmkhāu* (or *kīnkhā*?) which I. Khurdādhbih, 70, mentions under China, after *al-ḥarīr wal-firand*! *Kīmkhā* (perhaps *kīnkhā*) is ‘silk worked with gold and silver flowers, brocaded silk’, in English *kincob*, from Chinese *kin-hua*, see Quatremère, *Notices et extraits*, XIV/1, 214, 304, and Blochet, *Introduction*, 245.

Pp. 86–92. On India see now ‘Marvazi’ and my article ‘Gardīzī on India’, see above, p. 250. See below *ad* p. 235. P. 87 (§ 10, 12). Better: *pādshā’ī* (*pādshāhī*?) *az ān-i zanī buvadh Rāniya khwānand* ‘and the kingship belongs to a woman (whom they call) Rānī’.

Pp. 92–4. On Tibet see below, under p. 254.

Pp. 94–5 and 97–8. On Toghuḡghuz and Khallukh, see ‘Tamīm ibn Baḥr’.

P. 98. Several words are missing from the translation, which is misleading (I.U.). Read: ‘East and South of the Chigil country are the limits of the *Khallukh*; west of it are the limits of the Tukhs’. The commentary p. 227 should also be altered accordingly.

P. 100 (§ 18, 2): instead of *Q.rq.rkhān* A. Z. Validi Togan, *Ibn Faḍlān*, p. 328, suggests **Qirqiz-khan*, which would suit the indication that the customs which the inhabitants follow are those of the Khirkhīz.

P. 102. § 23, 2: ‘**Sabzavār*, a small borough on the road to Rayy and the chief place of the district *Byh*’ (S.J. and A.E.). The author definitely wishes to say that *Sabzavār* is the centre of the district which in the Arabicized form is called *Bayhaq*. The older Persian form must have been **Bēhak*, later **Bēha*. In fact, this latter form is attested in the ‘History of Bayhaq’ (563/1164), Tehran 1317/1938, p. 33, where various etymologies are suggested. See also Ḥāfiz-i Abrū, *Geography*, Brit. Mus., Or. 1577, fol. 185b, which explains that *Bēha* means *bihtar* ‘better’. It is possible that in our text *به* is a mis-spelling for *بیه* attested in the other sources and supported by the Arabic *بهق*.

P. 112. § 25, 1. For the title of the Samanids, Malik-i Mashriq, cf. Rūdakī in *Tārīkh-i Sīstān*, 323: Amīr-i Mashriq.

P. 113. § 25, 14. Now **Panjikand*, where recently remarkable discoveries have been made of ancient (Soghdian?) frescoes, see A. Yakubovsky, ‘The paintings of the ancient Panjikant’, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR* (historical series), 1950, vii, No. 5, pp. 472–491, and A. Yakubovsky in *Po sledam drevnikh kultur*, 1951, 211–270. More recently ‘Zhivopis drevnego Pyanjikenta’, Moscow, 1954, 200 pp., 41 plates. In fact *varagh* means ‘a weir’.

P. 119. § 25, 93. A Turkish document gives the reading **Y.kānknt* (Henning), but in Muqaddasi, 48, **Takābkath* and **Yakānkath* figure side by side, under Ishījāb. cf. *BSOAS*, ix/3, 552.

P. 122. § 26, 25: the division of Gurgānj into two parts, inner and outer (*bīrūnī*), is interesting as accounting for the *nīsba* of Abū-Rayḥān Bīrūnī.

P. 133. § 32, 2 (and p. 385): read **Alī ibn al-Layth al-Ṣaffārī*, as in Ist., 246 (the source of this report).

P. 144. On Sunbatmān see Minorsky, ‘Caucasica, IV’, in *BSOAS*, 1953, xv/3, p. 506: the fief of Sahl b. Sunbat, west of Shakkī.

P. 152. On the talisman against the crocodiles in Egypt (Fusṭāt) see Bīrūnī, *al-Āthār*, p. 259, who does not quote his source but in parallel passages refers to *al-Qibṭ* ('Egyptians'?).

P. 159, l. 15 (on the Rūs) instead of بزرک read : بزرک 'of large frames'.
cf. I. Rusta, 149 : *wa lahum juthath*.

P. 161, § 49, 2. See below *ad* p. 447.

P. 162, § 50.: the Khazar king 'is one of the descendants of Ansā'. A. Z. V. Togan, *Ibn-Faḍlān*, 1939, p. 270, has restored the name as 'sicher Asena, das heisst *a-se-na* oder *a-če-na*', a well-known name of an ancient Turkman clan or family. I strongly doubt this hypothesis. I treat the sources comparatively. In this part the *Hudūd* runs entirely parallel to I. Rusta and Gardīzī and there is no doubt possible that all the three are based on the same report.¹ The most important fact about the Khazars is that they had two rulers, the one personifying the idea of 'kingship' and the other acting as the real ruler.² This striking arrangement was known already to Sir J. G. Frazer, see his article 'The killing of the Khazar king', *Folk-lore*, xxvii, 1917, pp. 382–407, and *The Golden Bough*, iv, 120.

Ibn Rusta, 139–140, at the given place says³: 'They have a king who is called Īshā (Ayshā). The supreme king is Khazar Khāqān. He does not enjoy the obedience of the Khazars but has the name only. The power to command belongs to the Īshā, since in regard to control and the armies he is so placed that he does not have to care for anyone above him. Their supreme ruler is a Jew, and likewise the Īshā and those of the generals and the chief men who follow his way of thinking. The rest of them have a religion like the religion of the Turks'.

The corresponding passage in Gardīzī, ed. Barthold, p. 95 (and checked by me on the Cambridge MS., f. 190a) is as follows: 'And they have a king whose name is Abshād-malik the great (?) and they call the great king Khazar-Khāqān and the Khazar-Khāqān is only a bearer of the name, whereas the direction (*madār*) of every office (*shughl*) in the country and at the court (*hasham*) is incumbent on Abshād and no one is greater than Abshād. The greater chief and Abshād are Jews (by religion), as well as those who are inclined thereto (or friendly to him? to them?) as well as (some) commanders and noblemen (*buzurgān*). The others are holding a religion which resembles that of the Ghuz Turks ...'

The passage in the *Hudūd* (f. 38b) is as follows:—

آتل شہرست کی روز آتل بر میان وی بکذرد و قصبہ خزرانست و مستقر پادشاہ
است و اورا طرحان خاقان خوانند و از فرندان آنسا است و اندر نیمہ مغربی نشیند
ازین شہر باہمہ لشکر و این نیمہ بارہ دارد و اندرین (کذا) نیمہ دیگر مسلمانان و بت
پرستان اند و این پادشاہرا ہفت حاکمست اندرین شہر از ہفت دین مختلف بہر ساعتی
چون داوری بزرکتر افتد از پادشاہ دستوری خواہند یا اکہ کنند بحکم آن داوری.

¹ Marvazi, p. 33, also uses the same report but at his time the Khazars' power had been destroyed and he omits the part concerning the kings.

² cf. p. 333 on the division of power in Ghūr (§ 23, 48).

³ I quote D. M. Dunlop's translation, 'The History of the Jewish Khazars', 1954, 104.

We cannot, evidently, restore *A-se-na* in I. Rusta and Gardizī, and thus the name in the *Ḥudūd* (based on the same source) would be an *exception*. It is clear that the epitomizer has drastically compressed the original, and should we read *A-se-na* (which no other source knows) the last trace of dyarchy would disappear from the text. Misunderstandings in Persian sources while translating from the Arabic¹ are not uncommon and I have a strong suspicion that the author of the *Ḥudūd* in the passage *ولهم الملك يقال له ايشا* (see I. Rusta) has somehow misread an indistinctly written *ولد* as *له* and translated it accordingly *az farzandān*. In conjunction with the *two other parallel* sources this is likely, but if we treat each source separately, we run the risk of reading into it what we wish.

According to Constantine Porphyrogenitus, ch. 42, the first king was called *ὁ χακνός* and the second only *ὁ περχ* (*bek*). Therefore in Muslim sources one can suspect some minor title, like *shad*. Could we then restore the whole title tentatively *Ay-shad* ‘the Moon-shad’? See the names of Oghuz-khan’s sons Gün-khan, Ay-khan, etc.

P. 168. Several oversights in the dates. Ya‘qūbī’s history *ends* in 278/872. Qudāma wrote after 316/928 and died in 337/948. Bīrūnī’s ‘India’ *circa* 421/1030, but according to A. Z. V. Togan *circa* 1025. *Tafhīm* 420/1029 (also p. 170).

P. 172. Sulaymān, *Silsilat al-tawārīkh*, see now an excellent new edition of this text by the late J. Sauvaget, under the more appropriate title: *Akhbār al-Šīn wal-Hind*, 1948. Sulaymān-the-Merchant is now considered only as one of the sources of the book. cf. my ‘Marvazī’, 143.

P. 177. Another scion of the Gūzgānān house may have been the author of the *Jawāmi‘ al-‘ulūm*, ‘ibn Farīghūn’, see F. Rosenthal, *A History of Muslim Historiography*, 1952, p. 32. As he is said to have been a pupil of Abū Zayd Balkhī (d. 322/934) he must have lived in the earlier part of the 10th century.

P. 183. § 3, 12. *سباطى* occurs in Sarakhsi, see above, under p. 15.

P. 187. § 4, 9 : delete *Kra* after *Keda* !

P. 193. Read : *kasaka hya kapautaka* (H. W. Bailey).

P. 195. § 5, 6. Could not *Turfan* itself refer to the *T’u-fan* ‘Tibetans’ who occupied the region of ‘the four garrisons’ (Kashghar, Khotan, Kucha, and Qarashahr) between 790 and 860, see H. Hoffmann, ‘Tibets Eintritt in die Universalgeschichte’, in *Saeculum*, II, München, 1950, p. 270. A parasitic *r* appears in *Kucha-r* and some other names of this region (see in Marco Polo forms like *Succuir* for **Suk-chou*).

Pp. 196–200. The fact that the ‘Belt of the Earth’ was called *Mintāqat al-Ard* points to an Arabic source. Apart from I. Hauqal, 109–111 (ed. Kramers, p. 249) : *jabal ‘ala zahr al-ard*, see Bīrūnī, *India*, 96 (tr. I, 197), on ‘the range of towering mountains like the vertebrae of a pine stretching through the middle latitude of the earth from China to Galicia (Jalāliqa) in Spain’. A similar idea was known even in antiquity. The late E. Honigmann drew my attention (8th January, 1952) to Orosius, *adv. paganos*, I/2, 17–18, and H. Berger in *Wissen. Erdkunde*, 2nd ed., p. 418.² A different idea is found in the *Bundahishn*,

¹ I presume that the original source was Jayhānī and that the latter’s work was in Arabic.

² The exact reference is to H. Berger, *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen*, Leipzig, 1903, p. 418. The Macedonian writers gave the name of Caucasus to the (theoretical) range continuing the Taurus of Asia Minor throughout Asia. See Eratosthenes in Arrian’s *Anabasis*, v, 3, 1, and Strabo, xv, C689. The range formed the wall (*διαφράγμα*) between the northern and the southern zones of the Earth.

ch. VIII and XII ('the other mountains have grown out of Alburz, in number 2244 mountains'). I. Faqih, 295, transfers the centre to *jabal al-Qafq* (the Caucasus), which he traces down to Mecca. cf. also *Jihān-nāma* (circa A.D. 1200), quoted in Barthold's *Turkestan*, I, 81, on the orography of Central Asia and al-'Omari in Blachère, *Extraits des principaux géographes*, 1932, pp. 302-8, who speaks of *Jabal-Qāf* as *Umm al-jibāl* but purely theoretically and following Ptolemy. In any case, the passage of the *Hudūd* remains the most remarkable and realistic synthesis of little-known facts—nine centuries in advance of modern exploration! See my articles: 'A Persian Geographer of A.D. 982 on the Orography of Central Asia', in *Geogr. Jour.*, September, 1937, pp. 259-264, and 'Géographes et voyageurs musulmans', in *Bull. de la Soc. R. de Géographie d'Égypte*, Cairo, November, 1951, pp. 19-46.

P. 199. In the *Tārīkh-i Bayhaq*, Tehran, p. 19, the following countries are enumerated: 45. Ṭukhāristān, 46. Bilūr, 47. Qashmīr, 48. *Bilād al-thalj* ('country of the snow') and 49. Soghd.

P. 211. As Juvaynī, I, 47, spells فناکت, the original name must have been Panākat.

P. 212. The river Khwābdān is mentioned between Shiraz and Naubandagān, see Miskawaih, *The Eclipse*, ed. Margoliouth, III, 183.

P. 214. *Dahana-yi shīr* must correspond to the whirlpool which Abū-Dulaf strangely calls فم البواب, see my 'Abū-Dulaf Mis'ar ibn Muhahil's travels in Iran', Cairo, 1955, p. 60. cf. also the name of a whirlpool in the Caspian in I. Faqih, 290: *maudī' yuqālu lahu dahān-shīr wa fīhi durdūr*.

P. 218. § 6, 49. Add: Le Strange, 'Al-Abrik, the capital of the Paulicians', *JRAS*, 1896, p. 74.

P. 223. On China see in more detail my 'Marvazī' and the analysis of Abū-Dulaf's travels in the work quoted above *ad* p. 214.

Pp. 227 and 256. The most original part of the *Hudūd* is that concerning Central Asia and the eastern Turkish tribes. The source which our anonymous author used is probably Jayhānī's lost work, but even Jayhānī could have combined various reports (see my 'Marvazī', p. 7). *Prima facie*, the basic itineraries utilized for the northern and southern parts of the present-day territories of Sin-kiang (Chinese Turkestan) may seem to form one block, but it is quite possible that the original inquiries were carried out by different persons and at different times. The shifting scenes of the 9th century, when the Tibetan-Chinese struggles were still going on and the Uyghur and other Turkish tribes were advancing westwards, greatly complicated the unification of the heterogeneous reports.

In my commentary I assumed that the date of the occupation of Kan-chou by the Uyghurs was A.D. 843-4, and that—as only Tibetans and Chinese are mentioned in our paragraph on Kan-chou (§ 9, 7)—the description of the latter must be previous to that date. In my 'Tamīm', p. 278, following the advice of the late Prof. G. Haloun, I amended the dates of the Uyghur occupation—of Kan-su as 'after 847', and of the region of Turfan as 'after 866'—adding that both the principalities 'came into their full rights only at the beginning of the tenth century'. As according to the *Hudūd* Kuchā (§ 9, 10) was exposed to the attacks of the Toghuzghuz, I had admitted the possibility of the Toghuzghuz being, in this case, some remnants of the pre-Uyghur 'Western T'u-chüeh'. This hypothesis has been doubted by J. R. Hamilton in his carefully written

book *Les Ouïghours à l'époque des cinq dynasties* [907–960], Paris, 1955, p. 13, in which he says: ‘on doit dater cette mention de H.-‘Ā. (§ 9, 7: Kan-chou) des années après 848, et on remarque alors que les renseignements de la géographie persane sur Kan-tcheou et sur Koutcha sont pratiquement contemporains’.

If, however, we consider the chapter on the Toghuzghuz (§ 12), we see that the author represents the region of the Eastern T’ien-shan as solidly occupied by the Toghuzghuz, and in this case the term refers apparently to the Uyghurs. Gardīzī, whose sources are close to those of the *Hudūd*, adds that the religion of the Toghuzghuz settled in Panjikant (i.e. Bish-baliq) is Manichæan (*Dīnāvarī*), and this was a typical feature of the Uyghurs.

Consequently, in consideration of § 12, we might assign to the report on Kuchā even a considerably later date than 847 (or even 866)—for example ‘circa 900’—which would bring it nearer to the time of Jayhānī. Should the report on Eastern T’ien-shan (§ 12) be connected with that on Kuchā (§ 9, 7), it would be tempting to assume that the report on Kan-chou (§ 9, 7) also belongs to the same original source. However, in view of the possible multiplicity of reports such a conclusion is not indispensable: our § 9, 7, may still have in view the situation *circa* or before 847 (848?).

I am afraid that for the time being we cannot fix any closer the exact period to which the *Hudūd* refers. All we can say is that the reports on the distribution of the Turkish tribes are so remarkably circumstantial that they must be based on very careful intelligence. More precision may yet come from Saka, Soghdian, Tibetan, or Chinese documents.

P. 229. The late G. Haloun derived the name of Khumdān from Chinese, *BSOAS*, 1948, xii/3, p. 408.

P. 235. On India see now my ‘Marvazī’ and ‘Gardīzī on India’, *BSOAS*, 1948, xii/3, pp. 625–640. The king *Dahum* has been identified as Dharma-pāla of Bengal.

P. 251. *K.r.mān* in I. Athīr, xi, 108, is not Farmul but Kurram, as in Juvaynī, ii, 139.

P. 254. On Tibet see my ‘Marvazī’, pp. 89–91, and L. Petech’s remarks in *Oriente Moderno*, October, 1947, pp. 245–7. Also Petech, ‘Il Tibet nella geografia Musulmana’, in *Acc. dei Lincei, Rendiconti, scienze morali*, 1947, viii/2. More likely Tūsmat is to be looked for in the eastern part of Tibet.

P. 268. My analysis of the data of Tamīm is accompanied by an additional note, p. 431, which was further developed in my article ‘Tamīm ibn Baḥr’, *BSOAS*, 1948, xii/2, pp. 275–305, in which I arrived at the conclusion that this traveller visited the old Uyghur capital on the Orkhon. The reference to Qudāma should be 262, l. 5.

P. 271. *Misti kamtha* refers not to Panjikant (Bish-baliq) but to the preceding *Sēcu* (H. W. B.).

P. 272. *Bārlugh* mentioned between Panjikat (Bish-baligh) and Jāmghar is possibly identical with بَرْلِغ (read *برلیغ) which Juvaynī, ii, 225, mentions as the birthplace of Kurkūz, at a distance of 4 farsakhs from Bish-baligh.

P. 273. Instead of our *Stkath* (§ 12, 4) read **Sīkath*, i.e. Yar-khoto, see Chavannes, *Documents*, p. 7.

P. 274. Instead of Baluchi *gwād* read: *gwāt* (H. W. B.).

P. 277. The ruins of Qayaliq lie on the right bank of the Ili near Chingildi

(Dungene), in the district of Qara-tal, see *Kratkive soobshch. inst. mater. kulturī*, 1940, iv, pp. 43–5.

P. 280. In support of the Yaghma origin of the Qara-khanids see also *Mujmal al-tawārīkh*, Barthold, *Turkestan*, I, 20 : *padshāh-i yaghmā-rā Bughrā-khān khwānand*.

P. 287. Instead of *H.skī* Marvazi gives بعسكليه which A. Z. V. Togan reads *Haytīliya* (?) and O. Pritsak (1951) : *Baġa-ġigil*.¹

P. 288. Instead of *Chūnpān* O. Pritsak suggests **Jabbūy-khān*.

P. 295. In Birūnī, *Canon*, No. 597 (A. Z. V. Togan, 'Birunī's Picture of the World', p. 52) read : *Ajmā qasabat al-Khotan*. Now Achma, where some Saka MSS. were found. See Sir A. Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, I, 468, and II, Map : east of the Qara-tash-Chira river. Ūch and Bārmān (spelt *Fārmān*) are mentioned in *Zafar-nāma*, I, 485, in the course of 'Omar-shaykh's campaign.

P. 297. § 16. See correction *ad* p. 98.

P. 298. In Mīr Ḥaydar Tilpe's *Makhzan al-asrār*, Iskandar pādshāh is called the ruler of the Barlas, Qiyat, and M.qlīq (?).

P. 303. A. N. Bernstam locates Sū-yāb differently on the Great Kemin, above its junction with the Chu, see *Trudī Semirech. ekspeditsvi* (the Chu valley), 1950, map I.

P. 305, l. 1. *Ajlād* (اجلاد) stands probably for *Ighrāq* (اغراق), cf. p. 275, and Juvaynī, II, 138–9.

P. 309. Instead of Juvaynī, I, 101, read : II, 102.

P. 316. According to Nāsawī, *Sirat Jalāl al-dīn*, 25 (trans. 44), Tārkan-khatun, mother of Jalāl al-dīn, was of the tribe Bayāwut, one of the subdivisions of Yimāk. On the other hand, Juvaynī, II, 198, says that she was a Qanqlī. In the Russian Lavrentievsky chronicle (year 1184) the term половцы Емякове reflects the name *Yimāk*.

P. 319. On the Dominican Julian, see now D. Sinor, *BSOAS*, 1953, xiv/3, p. 598.

P. 326. § 23, 13. On Tabas-i Gilakī see A. Eghbal 'Amīr Dād Ḥabashī and Amīr Ismā'īl Gilakī', in *Yādegār*, III, No. 9, 49–63.

P. 327. § 23, 31. Ganj-rustāq was the fief of the well-known Rāfi' b. Harthama (rather : Rāfi' b. Naumard, Harthama being the name of his step-father), see I. Khallikān, IV, 326.

P. 328. § 23, 40. *S.ng* should be read *Shing, see *Akhbār al-daulat al-Saljūqiya* (M. Iqbāl), p. 10. Dandānaqān has been identified with Tash-rabat and described by B. Zakhoder in *Istor. zhurnal*, 1943, No. 3, pp. 74–7, and S. A. Yershov, in *Krat. soobshch. inst. mater. kult.*, 1947, xv, 126–136.

P. 330. The *Shāh-nāma* (Tehran), v, 1199, insists on the appurtenance of Gūzgān to Iran : 'and also Gōzgānān, the "blessed place", as it has been called by the ruler of the world (Manūchihr or Kay-Khusrau ?)'.¹

P. 331. In *Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, 360 (Raverty's transl. 1054), فيوار قادس is mentioned at 10 fars. from Kālbūn (?). cf. Ṭabari, II, 79, Balādhuri, 4–9, on the appointment (in 41/661) of Nāfi' b. Khālīd as governor of قادس من ابواران

¹ 'Von den Karluk zu den Karachaniden', *ZDMG*, Band 101, 1951, 271. In this article O. I. Pritsak has discussed several of the names appearing in the *Hudūd*, Gardīzī, Marvazī, etc. See also his other article, 'Die Karachaniden', in *Der Islam*, Band 31/1, 1953, 18–68.

**Ēvār-ān* possibly corresponds to *Fēvār* (should the latter be read with a ف: *βēvār*?). cf. Marquart, *Wehrōt*, 42.

P. 334. § 23, 49. On an expedition against نمرون (?), the king of Gharchistān, in 107/725, see Balādhuri, 428, Ṭabari, II, 1488, I. Athīr, v, 102. The name of the peak *Ishk means ‘a tusk’, see Minorsky, ‘Gardīzī on India’, *BSOAS*, 1948, XII/3, 635 (cf. *yishk* in *Vis-u-Rāmīn*).

P. 335. For the titles composed with *-banda*, cf. Ṭabari, III, 815–16: *Oṭrār-banda*.

It is tempting to identify Gurzivān (Qurzumān) with the kingdom of the petty king Waručān-sāh, mentioned in a Manichæan fragment. W. B. Henning, in *Jour. of the Greater India Soc.*, XI, No. 2, p. 88, came very near to this identification: ‘it would thus appear probable that the country Waruč lay in or close to, Gözgānān and Gharčistān, or at any rate to the S.W. of Balkh’. Our Gurzuvān satisfies this condition, and seems to represent a regular phonetic development *V.rč > Gurz*.¹ The position of Jurzuvān ‘between two mountains’ reminded I. Hauqal, 66, of the situation of Audaghusht in Morocco. cf. also Henning, *BSOAS*, 1947, XII/1, 49.

P. 336. § 23, 62. In 120/738 a famous battle was fought at Sān between Asad and the khaqan. It was called *waq’a Sān* or *waq’a Kh.rystān* (?), Ṭabari, II, 1608–1613. cf. Juvaynī, II, 219: *J.rīstān* (?).

P. 338. § 23, 70. On the antiquities on the Khulm river see also Dr. Vyacheslov, in the collectanea *Afghanistan*, Moscow, 1924, pp. 147–155: *takht-i Rustam*. cf. *Zafar-nāma*, II, 15.

P. 347. On the Khalaj see my ‘The Language of the Khalaj’, in *BSOAS*, 1940, x/2, pp. 417–437.

P. 349. It would be worth while to trace the origin of the name of the *Afghān* (not of the Afghan *nation*) to some Far Eastern tribe which at some time may have given its *rulers* to the Pathans. There is a Mongol tribe called Aokhan in Manchuria. O. Lattimore, *The Mongols of Manchuria*, 1935, pp. 264–5, tries to connect the name either with *aoga* ‘strength, might’, or with *aogan* ‘elder, senior’. It is curious that the epics of Keser-khan are known in the Burushaski language, which might indicate an early passage of some Mongol tribe through Pamir, or Western Sin-kiang to India. However, D. L. R. Lorimer, ‘An Oral Version of the Kesar saga from Hunza’, *Folk-lore*, XVII, No. 2, June, 1931, pp. 105–140, points out that the local version is derived from the Tibetan version of Ladakh. [See below, p. 270.]

P. 353. The historical sources on the present-day Tajikistan have been analysed by A. M. Belenitsky (on Khuttal) and N. Negmatov (Ushrūshana) in *Tajikskaya arkeol. ekspeditsiya*, I (1950), pp. 109–127, and II (1953), pp. 231–252.

Under §§ 25, 26, read: *Rēg-ar*, *lang-ar*, *band-ar*, though W. Henning (letter 3rd Nov., 1953) thinks that they may be of different formation. On Chaghāniyān see the ode of Farrukhī, *Divān*, 332, in which hints are made at the local mines of gold and silver.

P. 355, § 25, 60. Pāp, now Minchak-tepe, on the right bank of the Sir-darya, see Masson, in *Krat. soobshch. inst. mater. kul'turi*, 1940, IV, 53.

¹ It remains to be seen whether this name appearing in the neighbourhood of the Hephthalite nest in Khorasan (Marquart, *Wehrōt*, 40–5, and recently R. Girshman, *Les Chionites-Hephthalites*, 1948, p. 98) has any further links with the Hephthalite *Gurjara* in India.

P. 357, § 25, 78. I. Hauqal, 510, lists mints in Bukhara, Samarqand, and Īlāq.

P. 360. The famous 'Treasure of Oxus', now in the British Museum, is said to have been found near Fayḍābād.

P. 367. On the hot spring on the Lutkuh river see Morgenstierne, 'Iranian Pamir languages', p. 485: the hot geyser in the Garm-Chashma valley in Shughnan is called *shund* 'hot'.

P. 370. On Khwārazm see Sachau, 'Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Khwārazm', in *SBWAW*, Phil.Hist.Kl., 1873, LXXIII, 471–506, and LXXIV, 285–330. Very important is the passage in Muqaddasi, 260, in which 'al-Ma'mūn' (apparently the ruler of Khwārazm) is said to have captured Ātil (the former Khazar capital on the Volga). The numerous expeditions to Khwārazm headed by S. P. Tolstov have totally changed the archæological picture of the oasis. See S. P. Tolstov's *Ancient Khorezm* (in Russian), 1948, and the numerous later publications. On the Khwārazmian language, see the publications of W. Henning and A. A. Freiman (*Khorezmsky yazik*, I, 1951).

P. 378, § 29, 16. Correct: according to Yāqūt, I, 193: Arrajān (which al-Mutanabbī calls *Arjān*) 'is called *Arghān* by the Persians' (thence probably the vulgar form *Arghūn* in the *Zafar-nāma*, I, 600).

P. 384, § 31, 21. The author of the *Ta'rīkh Mayyāfāriqīn*, B.M. Or. 5803, fol. 180a, who travelled to the court of the 'king of Jibāl' (Fakhr al-daula), also mentions the tombs of Kisā'i, of Muḥammad b. Hasan sāhib of Abū Ḥanīfa, etc. In fact I. Faqīh, 253, refers to the *aṭbāq al-mudahhana* 'glazed dishes' of Rayy.

P. 391. On the region between Gīlān and Mūqān see Minorsky, 'A Mongol Decree', in *BSOAS*, 1954, xv/3, 515–527.

P. 392. The proverb: *laysa warā' 'Abbadān qaryatun* is quoted in Juvaynī, III, 20, and in Nizāmī's *Haft Paykār*, ed. Rypka, 146.

P. 395. On I. Hauqal's passage, p. 254, concerning the local rulers of Ādharbāyjān, see now Minorsky, 'The Caucasian Vassals of Marzubān', in *BSOAS*, 1953, xv/3, 514–529.

P. 397. *Sangān/Sanjān* is possibly the original home of the Rawwādids. See Minorsky, 'A Mongol Decree', *BSOAS*, 1954, xvi/13, p. 518.

P. 398. On Arrān, see new geographical data in Minorsky, *Studies in Caucasian History*, 1953, and 'The Caucasian Vassals', *BSOAS*, xvi/3.

P. 341. In addition to the important list of Caucasian highlanders in the *Armenian Geography*, see also the list in the Armenian historian Eḷishe (Russ. transl., p. 157) and the report on the journey of the bishop Israel in Moses Kalankatvats'i, II, ch. 39. See also the analysis of data on Daghestan in Minorsky, *Studies in Caucasian History* (II)—ready for publication.

Pp. 405–411. The form attested in the sources before the 16th century is شروان *Sharvān, but already in the *Hudud* the form *Shīrvān* makes its appearance on f. 33b. The term 'Mazyadids' is misleading for it coincides with the designation of an entirely different Mesopotamian dynasty. The dynasty of Sharvān, as attested in Khāqānī's *Divān*, 50, 474, 686, called themselves *Yazīdiyyān*, 'Yazidids'. The later 'Kisrānids' also considered themselves as Yazidids. The tree on p. 405 has been revised in my *Studies* (II). [On the original form of the name see the quotations collected by Š. Nafisi in his article *Sharvān-va-Shīrvān*, in *Armaghān*, 1327/1948, No. 1 (Farvardīn), pp. 23–32.]

P. 411, § 37. Ibn al-Mujāwir's work is called *Ta'rikh al-Mustabṣir*, see now 'Descriptio Arabiae Meridionalis', I-II, edidit O. Löfgren, Leiden, 1951-4.

P. 418, § 42. Arabic descriptions of the Byzantine Empire are exhaustively quoted in A. A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, Bruxelles, I (1935), II (1950)—now entirely revised by M. Canard. cf. Minorsky, 'Marvazi on the Byzantines', in *Mélanges H. Grégoire*, II, 455-469. See also a short list of Byzantine titles in *Mujmal al-tawārīkh*, Tehran, 1318/1939, pp. 424-5.

P. 419. Read: 'the neighbouring kingdoms of the Burjān, Abar, Burghar, Saqāliba, Khazar, and others (wa ghayri-him)'. (Here *Abar* may refer to the Avars of *Daghestan*.)

P. 420, l. 2: the use of the term 'the Khazar sea' for the Black Sea is attested even in the history of the Seljuqs of Rum by Ibn Bībī, ed. Houtsma, IV, 129: *dhikr-i guzashtan-i lashkar-i sultān az daryā-yi Khazar*. The most probable explanation is that the author of the *Ḥudūd* misread خزر into جرزر

Jurz, which he then reproduced in the Persian form کزر *Gurz*. P. 422. The 'islands' of the Black Sea refer to the Taman peninsula, which, in point of fact, consisted of islands divided by branches of the Kuban, see V. I. Moshinskaya in *Vestn. drev. istorii*, vol. 3 (17), 1946, pp. 203-8. P. 425. An example of the strange deformations of the Northern Spanish names is found in the *Ākām al-marjān*, ed. A. Codazzi, p. 412: *والثغر الاعلى فيما يجاور بلاد الشماكسة ومن* (for people of Jacá (?), Huesca, Aragon).

P. 427, § 43. In his *Ibn Faḍlān*, A. Z. V. Togan has obscured the situation by playing down the rôle of the Slavs, while trying to give a new explanation of the term Saqāliba, p. 305: 'Anfangs, als man die Bulgaren, Burtasen und andere Völker der mittleren Wolga noch Saqāliba nannte, hat man das ganze System der Wolga als "Nahr al-Şaqāliba" bezeichnet, später aber, als das Wort "Şaqāliba" in Bezug auf Ost- und Nordeuropa mehr für die germanischen und finnischen Völker, und speziell (*sic*—V.M.) für die Germanen und baltischen Völker verwendet wurde, bedeutete "Nahr al-Şaqāliba" offenbar nur die Obere Wolga'. For the situation in 10th-century Europe—which had changed since the times of Ptolemy and Tacitus—see the independent contemporary reports on the Saqāliba by Mas'ūdi (A.D. 943) in Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 95-160; and by Ibrāhīm ibn Ya'qūb (A.D. 355/965) in Th. Kowalski, *Relatio Ibrahīm b. Ja'kūb de itinere slavico*, Kraków, 1946. [See below, p. 270.]

B. N. Zakhoder, in his review of my 'Marvazi', *Izv. geogr. obshch.*, 1943, 75/6, pp. 25-43, has objected to my identification of the Saqāliba kings with the Moravian princes. The fact is that the Arabs often fused their information on various kinds of Saqāliba in the same rubric. Thus Moravia could be placed under the same roof as the town وانتبث (This latter (*Ḥudūd*, 431, note 4), has still considerable chances to reflect the name of the *Vīetic*, *Vyatichi*, as first suggested by Westberg, 'Beiträge', 1899, p. 213, despite Marquart, *Streifzüge*, 200.)

P. 432, § 44. In Soviet literature the origin of the Rūs (or rather of their name) is still debated with great animation—although the events of the 9th-10th centuries have no more bearing on the situation obtaining in the 20th century than the origin of the names *France* or *Prussia* on contemporary politics. Some arguments seem to miss the point and tone down such facts as

the terminology used by Const. Porphyrogenitus and the *Initial Russian Chronicle*, new edition, 1950, I, 24. To the literature quoted at the beginning of § 44 (p. 432) should be added V. Barthold's 'Arabskie izvestiya o russkikh', written in 1918 but published posthumously in 1940, in *Soviet. Vostokovedeniye*, I, 15-50. See also the unexpected new facts on the expeditions of the Rūs on the Caspian, in Minorsky, 'Rus' v Zakavkazye', in *Izv. na instituta za bŭlgar. istoriya*, Sofia, 1954, v, 377-380. Pp. 432-3: the term *Warank* first emerging in Birūnī was probably heard by the latter from the Bulghar ambassador to Sultan Maḥmūd, see Minorsky, 'On some of Biruni's informants', in *Al-Birūnī Commemoration Volume*, Calcutta, 1951, pp. 233-6. P. 436, note 2: the identity of *Arthā* with the Finnish Erzya is far from conclusive. By no means would the Arabs have confused the appearance of a Finnish people with the Rūs of Kŭyāba (Kiev) and Novgorod. The character ث in *Arṯā* is highly

problematic and, having regard to the variant ابارقه and to the fact that among the goods coming from *Arthā* (Iṣṭakhri, 226) was *riṣās* 'lead or tin', one should not discard Chwolson's tentative identification of this territory with Biarmia, though not with *Perm* but with the old region of the Sagas near the White Sea and Lake Ladoga, visited by Norsemen from Norway, cf. M. A. Tallgren, 'Biarmia', in *Eurasia septentrionalis*, 1931, VI, 100-120.

P. 438, § 45. A. Z. V. Togan, *Ibn Fadlan*, 317, writes of the Inner Bulghar: 'hier die Donau Bulgaren, sonst die Kaukasischen Bulgar-Balqaren'. Some confusion in the use of this rare term is not excluded, but D. M. Dunlop, *The history of the Jewish Khazars*, 1954, 218, retains the interpretation of I. Hauqal's reference (p. 279, second edition, 291) to Inner Bulgaria as having in view the Danube Bulgaria.

P. 442. On the Arab occupation of Apulia and Bari and their expeditions against Ragusa, see Babinger, *Raguse* in *EI*.

P. 444, § 48. On the Alans a mass of information has been systematized in V. I. Abayev's articles collected in *Osetinsky yazık*, I, 1949. See also Minorsky, 'The Alan capital Magas', in *BSOAS*, 1952, xiv/2, 221-238: Mas'ūdi's *Maḡhaṣ*, interpreted in the manuscripts as ديانة, should be restored as ذبابة 'a fly'! P. 446: Marquart's interpretation of *Cherkes* as *Chār-Kas* 'the four Kas' finds support in the name of one of Saladin's generals: چهاركس, Abul-Fidā, iv, 245.

P. 447. On the Sarīr, see Nizāmī's poem *Iskandar-nāma* (*Sharaf-nāma*), ch. XL, ed. Ali-zade and Bertels, Baku, 1947, p. 300. P. 448: خندان must certainly be restored as * خيداق; in Khaqani, *Divān*, p. 240, غيداق. *Barshaliya* (*Barashliya*?) most probably corresponds to *Varač'an* (in Armenian) and the present-day *Bashlī* (**Barash-lī*) 'borough'. As a parallel to our رنجس (or rather دنجس) one can quote ديكس in the *History of Bāb al-abwāb*. The place probably corresponds to the present-day Dilgasha.

P. 450, § 50. See now D. M. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazars*, Princeton, 1954. cf. also S. T. Eremian, 'Moses of Kalankatuk' on the embassy of the Albanian prince Varaz-Trdat to the Khazar khakan Alp-Ilitver', in *Zap. Instit. Vostokoved.*, 1939, VII, 129-155. A. Z. V. Togan's article 'Die Völkerschaften des Chazarenreiches', see above, p. 258, is vitiated by his polemical

tone and contradictions. On the one hand he admits the compilatory character of the Islamic sources (p. 40) and their tendency to fuse heterogeneous materials (pp. 45, 49 : ‘zusammengeworfen’; p. 61 : ‘verworren’). On the other hand, he accepts the data of the *Ḥudūd* on Eastern Europe literally and reconstructs them into a rather fantastic scheme (pp. 43–4) which he then tries to identify with the area over which ran the writ of the Khazar khaqans (p. 45). My own contention was to analyse the composition of § 50, which is almost definitely an *amalgam* of the sources partly known to us (I. Khurdādhbih, Iṣṭakhri) and partly capable of being reconstructed from the combination of such parallel sources as I. Rusta, the *Ḥudūd*, and Gardizī.

P. 453. The later *Saq̄sīn/Sakhsīn* is definitely a haplology of I. Khurdādhbih’s *Sārigh-shīn* (or better **sīn* ‘tomb, monument’, as the form *Saq̄sīn* seems to suggest). This assumption of mine has an importance for the mutual fixation of the position of either of them. **Khamlīkh* cannot be *Khan-balīkh*, as already stated by Marquart. The position of Sarkel/Sharkel/Bela-veza has been fixed near Trekh-Ostrovnyaya, above the place where the Sakarka (whose name seems to reflect *Sarkel*) joins the Don (on the left bank), see K. V. Kudryashov in *Izv. Ak. Nauk.* (historical section), 1947, iv/6, pp. 536–568. P. 459, para. (7), the quotation from the *‘Zafar-nama* should be omitted, because طانوس should be restored as *طانوس Tanus, as the plateau above Khunzakh (Avaria) is called.

P. 460. The mistake in the title of § 51, which in our MS. is *Burtās*, was already noticed by Barthold in an additional note (Russian text, p. 32, note 3) : ‘(Our source) erroneously refers the report on the Bulgars (*BGA*, vii, 141) to the Burtās, see the title of the king (*Alm.š*), the Islamic religion and the three tribes (*aṣṇāf*). The confusion of the Bulghar with the Burtās is also found in Yāqūt, i, 567’. In full agreement with these remarks, and in conformity with I. Rusta, 141, I have restored the title of § 51 as : ‘[Bulkār]’. A. Z. V. Togan, who disapproves of this indispensable improvement (‘Völkerschaften’, p. 44) must have neglected to read either Barthold’s or my own explanations. In addition to the excellent old book by Shpilevsky, *Ancient towns and other Bulghar-Tatar remains in the government of Kazan* (in Russian), Kazan, 1875, see now B. D. Grekov, ‘The Volga Bulgars in the 9th–10th cent.’, in *Istor. Zapiski*, 1945, vol. 14, pp. 3–37, and A. P. Smirnov, *The Volga Bulgars* (in Russian), Moscow, 1951, 275 pp.

P. 462, § 52. See now Rikov, *Sketches of the history of Mordva according to archeol. data*, Moscow, 1933, 122 pp., and E. I. Goryunova, ‘Selische Polyanki’, in *Krat. soobshch. inst. mater. kulturī*, xv, 1947, 106–110 (the author knows the *Ḥudūd* and identifies the Burtās with the Moksha Mordvans). I must again stress the fact that the *Ḥudūd* locates the Burādhās (Burtās) to the west of the Volga. To the older Iranian elements in the Volga languages I wish to add the name of the ‘old man of the woods (леший)’ in Chuvash : *arzurri* (*BSOAS*, xii/1, p. 81) which may be *arzur-āri*. The second element is Turkish, *ār* ‘a man’, but the first strikingly resembles the Avestan and Pahlavī *arzur* ‘wood’, which (according to Marquart) underlies also the name of Shahrāzūr (in Iraq).

P. 465, § 53. See H. Grégoire, ‘L’habitat primitif des Magyars et les Σαβάρτοι ἀσφαλοι’, *Byzantion*, 1938, xiii, 19–30, where he wishes to identify the *V.n.nd.r* with the settlers from Adrianople established on the Danube between 813 and 836. The fact is that the *V.n.nd.r* seem to be connected with the Eastern Bulgarian tribes (see pp. 466–7).

P. 468. I wrote: ‘The qualification of the *V.n.nd.r* in our sources as cowards (*badh-dil*)¹ may be due to a wrong interpretation of the word *tarsā* (which means both “Christian” and “coward”). In Gardīzī the *N.nd.r* are definitely called Christians (*tarsā*) and Rūmī, i.e. “Byzantines”, very possibly with reference to their religion’. This is slightly different from how A. Z. V. Togan puts it (*ibid.*, 41): ‘(Minorsky) bezichtigt den Verfasser [*scil.* of the *Ḥudūd*] erneut der willkürlich [?V.M.] veränderten Wiedergabe des Wortlautes seiner Quelle, so habe er das richtige Wort *tarsā* “Christ” bei Gardīzī einfach in *bad-dil* “Poltron” abgeändert’. My entirely objective purpose was to account for the discrepancy of the two parallel sources. I have yet to hear of a different explanation.

P. 473, § 56, 2. *Kalāh-bar* is not Kra but Kedah, which lies south-east of the northern corner of the Kra peninsula in Malaya.

LONDON-CAMBRIDGE, 1937–1955.

¹ Different from *badh-rag*, see Vocabulary.

CORRECTIONS

P. 254, last line. For *bahār-ān*, see other similar words referring to festivals and periods of time: *bāmdād-ān*, *khatna-sūr-ān* and even *khāch-shūr-ān* (for the Armenian Twelfth-tide).

P. 265. G. N. Roerich, ‘The epic of King Kesar of Ling’, in *JRAS. Bengal*, 1942, VIII/2, p. 311, is also definite about the birth of the epic in north-eastern Tibet. My second reference to Mongols should be omitted.

P. 267. After Kowalewski add: and A. Z. V. Togan’s own quotation of Khuwārizmī, No. 1593 (indicating the *changes* which had taken place in the area of Ptolemy’s *Germania*).